



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

biography to quote entire a poem written for the purpose of ringing in the names of an author's principal works. Such a poem savors too much of the rhymed charade. There is, at any rate, little excuse for quoting two such effusions in their entirety, as is done on page 223 and 224 of Henning's book, particularly when the space for telling the whole story of Spielhagen's life and achievements is so limited.

An appendix presents a chronological list of those of Spielhagen's works which have appeared in book form. The list is complete, although the date of publication is in a number of cases inaccurate. The *Amerikanische Gedichte* (renderings of American poems), were first published in 1856; Michelet's *Die Liebe* (a translation from the French), appeared in 1858; Michelet's *Das Meer*, in 1861; *Problematische Naturen*, first part 1860, second part (*Durch Nacht zum Licht*) 1861; *Die von Hohenstein*, 1863; *Vermischte Schriften*, 1863-1868; *In Reih' und Glied*, 1866; *Hammer und Amboss*, 1868; *Die Dorfkokette*, 1868; *Sturmflut*, 1876; *Plattland*, 1878; *Uhlenhans*, 1884; *Stimme des Himmels*, 1894.

Attention might also be called to a number of errors, principally typographical, occurring throughout the book. Hansk, p. 42, l. 3, should be changed to hawk; Nilnotes, p. 88, l. 2, to Nile Notes; Willian, p. 89, l. 6, to William; Attenäum, p. 90, l. 29, to Athenäum; bread, p. 165, l. 19, to bred; peu, p. 182, l. 30, to pen; Balzar, p. 65, l. 26, to Balzac; oder, p. 193, l. 14, to *als*. The usefulness of the notes collected in a body at the end of the volume is somewhat impaired by the omission of a text reference to one of them and the confusion that would naturally arise from such omission. The difficulty can be remedied by inserting <sup>229</sup> after the word Bismarck on page 217, ninth line from the bottom, and increasing all following reference numbers by one, *i. e.*, the present 229 becoming 230, 230 becoming 231, etc. A correction of statement on page 88 is also necessary. The American publisher himself did not come to Leipzig and visit Spielhagen. *Finder und Erfinder* (II, 285) informs us that negotiations for the English translation of German folk songs were conducted through a Leipzig publisher.

Dr. Henning's book is embellished with two

photographs of Spielhagen, taken in the year 1890 and 1909, respectively, also with facsimiles of manuscript, one containing the first pages of *Freigeboren*, the other those of *Sturmflut*. It is unfortunate that the splendid steel engraving of Spielhagen by Rohr, hidden away in Ziemssen's little pamphlet, could not have been reproduced in place of the present frontispiece.

M. M. SKINNER.

Stanford University, Calif.

## ITALIAN VERSE AND VERSE ON ITALY

ST. JOHN LUCAS: *The Oxford Book of Italian Verse, xiii<sup>th</sup>-xix<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1910.

WILLIAM EDWARD MEAD: *Italy in English Poetry* (Modern Language Publications, 1908, pp. 421-470).

ROBERT HAVEN SCHAUFFLER: *Through Italy with the Poets*. New York, Moffat, Yard & Company, 1908.

GEORGE HYDE WOLLASTON: *The Englishman in Italy*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1909.

RUTH SHEPARD PHELPS: *Skies Italian. A Little Breviary for Travellers in Italy*. Methuen & Co., London, 1910 (also, Merrill, Indianapolis, 1910).

The Oxford Golden Treasury of Italian verse is now available and should be owned by all interested as teachers or as readers in Italian. It serves well for literary study in the elementary branches, and its compactness adapts it to the needs of those who desire a rapid, enjoyable view of Italian poetry. Its special appeal will be to those who love poetry in itself. For that ever widening circle of cultured people, capable of enjoying foreign art in original forms, and desirous of spending a casual moment of leisure in contact with the expression of great souls, it will be a blessing. It is interesting also as an evidence of the esthetic temper of its compiler. It is not, however, typical of that accurate, penetrating spirit that has given us Toynbee and Fitzmaurice-Kelly. Rather it contains a generous

amount of misinformation, but which the serious reader will correct with his D'Ancona and Bacci. On the whole, then, it is deserving of praise.

Having neglected most that is of serious importance in the history of Italian literature, the book takes us to the notes. Here we learn occasionally the dates of the authors, except possibly where our little Larousse might fail us. *Parola*, we are told, comes from *Low Latin parabola*; the *strambotto* originated in Sicily, as the compiler learned from d'Ancona. The *caccia* is not even mentioned. The last word in the phrase "quanto più lo 'nvoglia" equals *involve*? The note on *Miramar* is: Maximilian was shot in Mexico, June 9, 1867. In short, the notes have every quality except usefulness and system. One may suggest that a line or two of exegesis, especially for the more interesting poems, would be worth infinitely more than this sixty pages of jumbled, unsubstantial details.

The selections, as I have said, cannot fail to be of use and of interest. But the compiler seems to see only one element in poetry, namely, the emotional. Whereas, it seems to me, poetry that is really significant, really typical, contains intellectual substance, blended with emotional sensibility into artistic form. We can read many of these selections and have absolutely no idea of their authors. Why select, for example, to illustrate Carducci, *Nevicata* and *Funere mersit acerbo*? No one will complain surely of the presence of these poems, except that they might have made room for the Clitumnus ode or that In a Gothic Church. Here we should have had at once the typical and the efficient, a notion of Carducci's method and of his view of life. One notes further a complete neglect of modern dialect poetry, a neglect which is hard to justify.

The fact is, that Mr. St. John Lucas has been judging the broadest and deepest of literature with Swinburne in his ears: with a real appreciation nevertheless of those elements that correspond with what one might call the least virile elements in Wordsworth and Burns. Whereas an adequate treatment of the subject must view with equal regard the pagan, the mystic, the plastic—in short, all the philosophical elements that determine the Italian esthetic consciousness.

Professor Mead and Professor von Klenze have

recently dipped into a beautiful theme: the interpretation of Italy in modern literature. Professor Mead's running commentary on Italy in English poetry, will be of much utility to future investigators of this subject, as general bibliography. It is to be hoped he will later give us a more trenchant analysis of his material than the scope of his first article allowed; and go on to more significant generalizations than were there attempted. He poses, for instance, the problem of the scarcity of Italian themes in early English poetry before the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a problem which he views as insoluble, whereas positive light can surely be thrown on the subject from a consideration of the general question of landscape in literature and painting. He is already well advanced toward the answer when he distinguishes the romantic influence in poems of more recent date; which is, in fact, a substitution of realistic observation for inspiration that is purely literary and classic. We ought indeed carefully to distinguish between the themes that are purely the reflex of classical erudition (for example, Poe's *Coliseum*) and those derived from modern Italian history (Whittier's *From Perugia*) and from Italy as a storehouse of natural and artistic beauty. We ought also to approach the esthetic aspects of the subject rather from the viewpoint of Italian interpretation than from that of judging the intrinsic merits of the authors as masters of poetry and style. This would afford almost endless occasion for valuable elucidation of really obscure points: in fact, each poem is an esthetic problem in itself. As I have said, the theme is a beautiful one. This new treatment also would not neglect entirely John Addington Symonds, who is surely one of the greatest Italian interpreters. Nor would it contain the statement that "Ruskin is not commonly thought of as a poet" after the almost definitive analysis of Ruskin by W. C. Brownell, who makes the poetic aspect of Ruskin's work the dominant feature.

Professor Mead's study makes a valuable preface to the anthologies of Stauffer, Wollaston and Miss Phelps, which, with the scientific motive in the background, are, as Mr. Stauffer happily suggests, really the traveller's poetic Baedeker. The books to a certain extent supplement each other, though they naturally overlap with frequency. Mr. Stauffer's compilations are the

most extensive, owing principally to a large number of translations; Mr. Wollaston has maintained a noteworthy artistic tone, while Miss Phelps has shown an erudition and taste unusually "peregrine." It was the privilege of the compilers, working on a theory that required neither exhaustiveness nor rigid selection, to omit or include what they chose. Possibly, however, the principle of translation was a dangerous one to admit in the works of Mr. Stauffler and Miss Phelps, since here the question of selection becomes serious. It may be interesting to note, for instance, that Petrarch's noble ode, *Salve cara deo tellus sanctissima salve*, was written in precisely the same situation as that by Auguste Barbier, given by Miss Phelps.<sup>1</sup> It would have made a good pendant in Mr. Stauffler's book to the Praises of Italy by Vergil, which in turn recalls its stupendous Carduccian epigon, *The Fountains of Clitumnus*. So the poem of Whittier, *From Perugia*, recalls the remarkably similar one of Carducci on the execution of Cairoli. Was it poverty of material that explains the presence of Alfred Austin's ode to Capri both in *Skies Italian* and *Through Italy with the Poets*? Here we have the verse:

'Tis small, as things of beauty oft times are . . .

to which we prefer the homely "Good things often come in small packages." And a point or two of editorship: Miss Phelps gives a series of descriptive epithets entitled *Città d'Italia*. It is derived from Longfellow's *Poems of Places*, where it is described as "lines of some unknown author." It is, as a matter of fact, one of those folk poems on places, of which numberless specimens can be found in Italian proverb books, and of course, of unknown authorship. The one in question certainly comes from Siena. The Italian sonnet, *Poi che spiegato ho l'ali al bel desio*, translated by Symonds under the title *The Philosophic Flight*, is indeed given in the *Eroici Furori* of Giordano Bruno; but it was written, not by Bruno, but by Tansillo. Mr. Wollaston had the good idea of equipping his poems with historical and exegetical notes. But they are very hastily com-

piled. He has not pointed out the indebtedness of Symonds for the beautiful motive, "Praise to thy servant death" in the ode in the graveyard of Mentone, to the *Laudes Creaturarum* attributed to Saint Francis. Silvio Pellico was not first imprisoned in the Piombi, as a very superficial examination of the *Prisons* would have shown. Everyone knows that Tennyson's *frater ave atque vale* was taken not from the ode of Catullus to Pallas, but from the magnificent lines at his brother's grave. The poem of T. Moore on Venice is, of course, a reflection of that contemporary hostile view of the Republic which blamed her for doing successfully what every one else in Europe was doing more or less so. Modern criticism has, of course, removed that stigma of ignominy which the Byronesque romancers, for the sake of creating good pot-boiling material, saw fit to fix upon Venice; as Mr. Wollaston could easily determine, not by reading the law-suit of the almost isolated case of Antonio Foscari, but by looking at the works of his illustrious compatriot, Horatio Brown. Modern criticism has also sympathized with the verdict against Foscari—almost unanimous, incidentally—considering only the facts that were present before the Council that tried him. When Venice discovered her mistake, she made the restitution that was possible after the death sentence had been carried out. The invective of Moore against Paolo Sarpi also required comment only for rectification of Moore's error. Everyone knows the rôle of the Cicada in poetry from Pindar to Carducci. Here is Mr. Wollaston's note: "The Cicada (*Cicada plebeia*, L.), Gr. *tettix*, is an insect belonging to the order Hemiptera, which comprises the bugs and lice [N. B. *bugs* in the English connotation, may it be said for American readers]. The grasshopper, the locust, the cricket are members of the order Orthoptera." But we are spared the entomology of the Cuckoo and the Nightingale.

These anthologies offer us in general poetry of a high class that is endlessly suggestive. The fine poem of A. W. Hare, entitled *Italy*, in Wollaston, treats a theme similar to that of Leopardi's ode to Italy offered by Schaffner and Miss Phelps. The contrast between the passive lament of the Italian and the eloquent optimism of Hare throws light on the interpretation of both poems. So

<sup>1</sup> The first view of Italy from the passes of the Alps impressed also Giovanni Berchet: cf. *Il Romito del ceniso*, in *Opere di G. B., Piroto*, Milano, 1863, pp. 101-106.

Symonds' *Southward Bound* sets off the similar method of Tennyson's *Daisy*, the former notable for a fine summary of Italian pagan tendencies. We agree with Professor Mead in seeing in Milton's sonnet, *On the late massacre in Piedmont*, little that is essentially Italian. Miss Phelps, who has contributed some good translations of her own to the collection, has in a prefatory sonnet given a happy turn to Browning's invocation "Oh woman country, wooed not wed," in recalling some feminine figures in Italian romantic legend, that introduce a delicate expression of Italian yearning. And we owe to her an inclusion of some masterly poems that escaped the other collections: here, for instance, Pembr's *Per gl'occhi almeno non v'è clausura*, for Perugia. In this we have confronted the mournful temper of Tuscan monasteries that recalls death, and the beauty of nature that invites to life—the theme of Carducci's Gothic Church. So her unique citation from Sir Rennel Rodd, *The Unknown Madonna*, presents a fine specimen of what Ruskinian criticism would be in verse. These observations could be carried to great length: as a testimony to the independence of Miss Phelps' method and the keenness of her judgment, which avoids the trite and is not blinded to the excellence of little known verse, not sanctified by cant, or the glamor of some great name. Her work is a labor of love, that finds its expression through scholarly channels.

A. A. LIVINGSTON.

Cornell University.

---

*The Authorship of Timon of Athens.* By ERNEST HUNTER WRIGHT, Ph. D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1910, pp. ix, 104. (Columbia University Studies in English.)

In his monograph on *Timon of Athens*, Dr. Wright makes a new examination of the evidence bearing on the various problems of authorship, and from this evidence and a study of the previous critical theories evolves a definite hypothesis concerning the play. The problems include the question of the sources of the plot, the theory of double authorship and the division of the play between the two writers, the relation of Shake-

spere's part to that of the other playwright, and the reconstruction of the original *scenario*. Dr. Wright emphatically favors the theory that Shakespeare was the first of two authors, not working in collaboration.

In considering the question of the sources Dr. Wright traces the successive appearances of the misanthropic Timon in literature from the period of the Peloponnesian War to the publication of the Shakespearean play. The scattered bits of Timon legend thus collected present no source which merits the term in the degree shown by the older *King John* or the *Taming of a Shrew*. It is conjectured, however, that source material was found in the Lives of Antony and Alcibiades in North's *Plutarch* and probably in the repetition of this sketch of Antony in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, in the academic play of Timon produced about 1600,<sup>1</sup> and perhaps in Lucian's dialogue, *Τίμων ἢ Μισάνθρωπος*. Dr. Wright is not inclined to believe in a lost source; and of the two possibilities about which there has been disagreement among critics he accepts the academic comedy and questions Lucian. The latter might have been known to Shakespeare and his contemporaries in either an Italian or a French translation, and the spirit of the tragedy rather resembles that of the Greek dialogue than that of the earlier Elizabethan versions of the Timon story. Nevertheless the relation between Lucian and *Timon of Athens* seems to Dr. Wright unproved and unnecessary. In concluding that the Timon comedy was a source, he reinforces a recent attempt<sup>2</sup> to demonstrate that the neglect of the academic production in this connection is not deserved, since this comedy alone supplies certain striking features of the plot and it is by no means impossible that it should have been known to Shakespeare.

The theory of double authorship is determined *de novo* by an exposition of the æsthetic contrasts and incongruities in technic and of the divergences in the characterization and the general structure of the play. These points are readily established. By use of the *criteria* thus gained, Dr. Wright proceeds to add one more to the numerous attempts

<sup>1</sup> *Shakspeare Society Transactions*, 1842.

<sup>2</sup> *Princeton University Bulletin*, vol. xv, no. 4, pp. 208-223.